

REMARKS

The claims were amended to make it clear that this invention relates to a synchronous digital telecommunications system.

In light of these amendments, the Examiner's observations in paragraphs 3-46 of the Office Action are now moot.

In relation to paragraphs 4-8 and 14-17, the Examiner alleges that claims 17 and 29 would have been obvious in view of the teachings of Reese and Keiles. However, these references cannot be combined for the purposes of alleging obviousness. Plainly, the disclosure in Reese relates to a video surveillance system and does not relate to the field of telecommunications. Furthermore, the disclosure of Keiles relates to a process control system to control the functioning of an industrial process having many process variables, as stated in col. 1, lines 20-24. Accordingly, Keiles also does not relate to the field of telecommunications.

The skilled person in the field of telecommunications seeking to solve a technical problem in that field would not look at disclosures in the field of video surveillance or industrial process control. In particular, the skilled person would not combine two unrelated documents in these unrelated fields. Accordingly, the present invention as defined by the pending claims is not obvious in light of Reese and Keiles.

Wherefore, a favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

489 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10017-6105

Tel: (212) 697-3750

Fax: (212) 949-1690



Alan Israel

Reg. No. 27,564